<center>**REMARKS**</center>

In this Amendment, claims 56, 58, 61, 63 and 66-69 are amended. Claims 70-73 are added. The application is now in condition for allowance for the following reasons:

REJECTIONS OVER INDEFINITENESS

Claim 66 is rejected as lacking antecedent basis for the phrase "**the** minimum amount of available memory." This is overcome changing "the" in this phrase to "a".

Claim 68 is rejected as lacking antecedent basis for the phrase "the remote storage device." This is overcome by amending claim 68 to depend from claim 66 which provides antecedent basis for this phrase.

REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 56 AND 63 OVER THE PRIOR ART

Independent claims 56 and 63 are rejected over Gustafson in view of Mittelstadt. This rejection should be withdrawn for the following reason:

Claims 56 and 63 are amended to require the baseline configuration, during and after the update, to remain stored in, and selectable for execution while in, the same "first" memory area it was in before the update. And the updated configuration is stored in, and selectable for execution while in, a different "second" memory area. This is opposite from the teaching of Gustafson. Gustafson's baseline ("old") configuration is moved to a "backup section" (col. 4, lines 1 and 45), and his updated configuration is created in the location that previously contained the baseline configuration (col. 4, line 47).

Furthermore, Gustafson does not disclose "two manually selectable configurations for execution" while both configurations remain in their respective memory locations as now claimed. Although Gustafson (col. 4, lines 50-67) discloses two configurations **stored** simultaneously in memory – the old configuration stored in backup memory and the new configuration stored in the "default location" where the old configuration previously resided – he does not suggest that **both** configurations are **executable** from their current locations as claimed. Gustafson's mobile device makes only **one** configuration executable at a time – specifically whichever configuration is in the "default location" at "startup". Specifically, Gustafson leaves the updated configuration in that "default location" if it is uncorrupted (col. 4, lines 56-60), and copies the old configuration from backup memory back to the "default location" if the updated configuration is corrupted (col. 4, lines 61-67).

Therefore, the rejection of claims 56 and 63 should be withdrawn.

NEW DEPENDENT CLAIM 70

New claim 70 is distinguished further from the prior art by the limitation it adds to independent claim 56. In that limitation, the updated configuration is set as the new baseline configuration by copying the updated configuration over the baseline configuration. This is impossible in Gustafson, because Gustafson's updated configuration was created by updating the old baseline configuration in-place (col. 4, line 47), so that only "a regular startup" (col. 4, line 58) is needed (*i.e.*, without any copy-over needed) to activate the updated configuration. Claim 70 is thus distinguished further from the cited art by the limitation it adds to claim 56.

NEW DEPENDENT CLAIM 71

New claim 71 is distinguished further from the prior art by the limitation it adds to independent claim 56. In that limitation, the updated configuration is set as the new baseline configuration by referencing the updated configuration's location in the second area of memory as the new baseline configuration instead of referencing the previous baseline configuration's location. This is supported in the specification at p. 8, line 15. This is impossible in Gustafson, because Gustafson's updated configuration was created in place of the old baseline configuration (col. 4, line 47), so that only "a regular startup" is called for -- *i.e.*, without changing a reference point -- to activate the updated configuration (col. 4, line 58). Claim 71 is thus distinguished further from the cited art by the limitation it adds to claim 56.

NEW DEPENDENT CLAIMS 72-73

New dependent claim 72 is distinguished further from the prior art by the limitation it adds to independent claim 56. This limitation is: transmitting database data, that is stored in the mobile device second memory area, to the update server for temporary storage, to make a required amount of memory available in the second area for storing of the updated configuration. This database data is exemplified in the specification (p. 12, line 3) as contact data. Although (as noted by the Examiner in rejecting claims 59 and 66) O'Neill [0044] discloses a mobile device uploading **software** to the **software** update "environment 215", that does not suggest the present limitation of uploading **database** data to the update server. In claim 73, the database data is re-indexed by the update server, which is not addressed by O'Neil. Claims 72-73 are thus distinguished further from the cited art by the limitations they add to claim 56.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS 56-62 AND 64-69

The remaining claims are dependent claims. They are distinguished further from the prior art by the limitations they add to the independent claims.

The application is therefore now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Rose

Mitchell Rose, (Reg. No. 47,906)
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216)586-7094